complaint and the proofs of service on each defendant; no discovery has been commenced.

This Court has original jurisdiction of the above-entitled action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and the action may therefore be removed to this Court pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1441 (b) and (c).

Copies of all process, pleadings and orders served on defendants in the above-entitled action are attached hereto. This notice is filed with this Court within 30 days after service on defendants of the summons and complaint. Consequently, defendants will respond to plaintiff's complaint in this Court.

#### **JURISDICTION**

The basis for federal jurisdiction in this case is 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1441(b). The fact supporting such jurisdiction is that plaintiff's complaint includes, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, causes of action alleging violations of plaintiff's civil rights by defendants.

Dated: <u>3-27</u>, 2008

MICHAEL J. AGUIRRE, City Attorney

Joe Cordileone

Senior Deputy City Attorney

Attorneys for Defendant City of San Diego

Document S File 03 2 LD 08 Case 3:08-cv-00580-WOH-POR ANS on First Amended Complaint FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE) (CITACION JUDICIAL) FILED NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: CIVIL BUSINESS OFFICE 16 (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): CENTRAL DIVISION City of San Diego, a municipal corporation and a Political Subdivision of the State of California and DOES 1-30, inclusive 08 FEB - 5 PM 2: 36 LLEAK-SUFERIOR COURT YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: SAN DIEGO CHENTY CA

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

(LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE

Tracy Means

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association.

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales.

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or (El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del de	emandante, o del dema	mey, is: ndante que no tiene abo	RECE FEB 2:
Paula S. Rosenstein, Esq. (SBN 126264) Rosenstein, Wilson & Dean, P.L.C.	619-232-8377		7 7 7 S
1901 First Avenue, Suite 300, San Diego, CA 92101 DATE:	Olada ba	M. McKin	= Sm
(Fecha) FFR () 5 2000	Clerk, by (Secretario)	,	Si Rediunto)
(For proof of service of this summons use Proof of Service of Summons	nons (form POS-010)	<b>#</b>	
- Par prints do antigan do ante situités use al formularie Donat et	C	200 0401	
MATERIAL DESCRIPTION OF STATE OF THE BERSON SERVICE TO THE BERSON	Service of Summons, (/ /ED: You are served	POS-010)).	
ISEALING MANAGEMENT 1. as an individual defendance of the control	NED: You are served nt.		
INTERPORT OF A PROPERTY OF A PARTY OF A PART	TED: You are served nt.  r the fictitious name of	(specify) :	, .
INTERPORT OF A PROPERTY OF A PARTY OF A PART	TED: You are served nt.  r the fictitious name of	(specify) :	cipal jorporation
INTERIOR CONTROL CONTR	TED: You are served nt.  r the fictitious name of	(specify) :	cipal for poration
INTERIOR CONTROL CONTR	TED: You are served nt.  r the fictitious name of	(specify) :	(i'pal lorporation li'then subdivision (o'minor) of the
INCOMPLETE PERSON SERVED 1. as an individual defendant as the person sued under the pers	r the fictitious name of  it for the fictitious name of  corporation)  lefunct corporation)	(specify):  D(5)	( 'pal for poration ( 'fical subdivision ( (minor) of the ( (conservatee) State ( (authorized person)
INDEST: HALL  OTC VRESIANAME	r the fictitious name of  the fictitious name of  corporation)  lefunct corporation)  essociation or partnersh	(specify):  D(5)	(i pal for poration (i facal subdivision of the of
DATE FEB 2 7 2008  DECEMBE  3. On behalf of (specify): (CCP 416.10 (c) CCP 416.20 (d)	r the fictitious name of  the fictitious name of  corporation)  lefunct corporation)  essociation or partnersh	(specify):  D(5)	(i'pal for poration (i'fical subdivision () (minor) of the () (conservatee) state () (authorized person)  Cal-top

Filed 03/2

2	
3	
4	

12

14 15

18

19 20

22

23 24

25 26

- 3. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times herein mentioned, Defendants, and each of them, were agents, servants and employees of each of the remaining defendants. Further, Defendants, and each of them, in doing the things hereinafter alleged, were acting within the course and scope of such agency, servitude and employment, and with the permission and consent of each of the other defendants.
- 4. Plaintiff Tracy Means was an employee of the City of San Diego for approximately 8 years. During this time, she held the position of Deputy Director, Airports Division. Most of the time she was employed by the City, the Airports Division was part of the Real Estate Assets Department. For the majority of the time that she was employed by the City, her immediate superior was William T. Griffith, Director of the Real Estate Assets Department.
- 5. Ms. Means left her employment with the City of San Diego in November 2005. Throughout her employment, Ms. Means had received at least above average employment evaluations.
- 6. After her departure from her employment with the City, Plaintiff was sued in a civil action styled City of San Diego, a municipal corporation and a political subdivision of the State of California. Plaintiff v. Tracy L. Means (a.k.a. Tracy L. Williams), an individual, et al., San Diego Court Case No. GIC 858344. (hereinafter "underlying action").
- 7. The original Complaint in the underlying action was filed on December 13, 2005 and served on Plaintiff Means on December 15, 2005. Ms. Means filed an Answer to that Complaint on January 13, 2006. Subsequently, amended the complaint three more times such that at the conclusion of the lawsuit, the operative complaint was "Plaintiffs' Fourth Amended Complaint", a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A". Ms. Means also filed an Answer to the Fourth Amended Complaint.
- 8. The City's Complaint and the subsequent versions accuse Tracy Means of awarding fourteen written purchase order contracts for consulting services to Co-Defendant Airport Business Solutions, Inc. The Complaints allege that the purchase order contracts resulted in actual payments in the sum of \$218,527.00 to Co-Defendant Airport Business Solutions, Inc.
- 9. Ms. Means filed a Motion for Summary Judgment in the underlying action arguing that there was no evidence to create a triable issue of material fact and, in fact, that there was no evidence to support the allegations made against Ms. Means. The Motion for Summary Judgment made by Ms.

25

26

27

- Means was granted by the Superior Court of California, County of San Diego on August 10, 2007. A Judgment was entered in Ms. Means' favor on September 20, 2007. A true and correct copy of the Judgment is attached hereto as Exhibit "B".
  - 10. The City filed a Notice of Appeal of the Judgment on October 9, 2007.
- 11. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that City Attorney, Michael J. Aguirre did not ask for or receive permission to file the original complaint against Ms. Means nor did he ask for or receive permission to continue the suit and file the four subsequent versions of the complaint. In spite of knowing these facts, the City Council repeatedly ratified the continuation of the frivolous and unlawful actions.
- 12. On February 27, 2006 and again on March 7, 2006, the City Council for the City of San Diego addressed the question of whether the City would provide Tracy Means a defense in the civil action. A motion was made to deny Ms. Means a defense. The motion passed.
- 13. On September 7, 2006, in a letter by her attorney to the Mayor of San Diego and City Council, Ms. Means again asked the City government to take action which would stop the baseless litigation against her and adopt a resolution directing the City Attorney to dismiss the suit. In the letter, it was pointed out that the City government had its own duties and responsibilities relating to the abuse of its authority separate and apart from that of Mr. Aguirre's. A true and correct copy of the letter sent to the City's Mayor and Council is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit "C".
- 14. Despite repeated attempts by Ms. Means to have the lawsuit withdrawn, dismissed or otherwise ended, the Mayor, City Council and City Attorney separately and together failed and refused to do so in spite of the multiple requests by the Plaintiff. In so doing, Defendants, through their action and inaction, acted under color of law and in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1983. These officers, together and separately, hold the policymaking power for the Defendant City of San Diego.
- 15. Moreover, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the City Council believes that the City Attorney acted in violation of his obligations as City Attorney for the City of San Diego in bringing this lawsuit and others without the Mayor's or City Council's authorization or approval and in violation of state law and the rights of the Plaintiff. Despite this belief about the limitations on the City Attorney's authority, the City Council allowed this lawsuit to continue and was

5

10

8

13

22

20

deliberately indifferent to the fact and knowledge which the City Council had that he had insufficient evidence to support the allegations against Ms. Means being made in the underlying action.

Filed 03/2

16. In failing and refusing to end the underlying action and in passing and refusing to pass various resolutions regarding the underlying litigation, Defendant made official policy which violated Plaintiff's Constitutional rights.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(42 <u>U.S.C.</u> §1983; Equal Protection Under U.S. Constitution Amend. XIV)

- 17. Plaintiff hereby refers to Paragraphs 1 through 16, inclusive, and incorporates them herein by this reference.
- 18. Plaintiff Tracy Means was, during the time period for which she was accused of engaging in wrongdoing, an employee of the City of San Diego.
- 19. City Attorney Aguirre has initiated lawsuits against other current and former employees of the City of San Diego. In each of them, the City of San Diego has provided a defense for the employee. In this case, despite multiple requests, Defendant continued the ill-considered, frivolous, and unlawful underlying action deliberately indifferent to the harm being caused to Plaintiff while simultaneously refusing to provide her with a defense to the underlying action. However, no other employee or former employee has had a suit filed against them for actions taken while acting in their capacity as an employee of the City. Ms. Means was deliberately singled out for unfair and inequitable treatment in violation of the law.
- 20. Defendants were deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff and refused to take any meaningful action to stop the loss of her life, liberty or property interests she was suffering by the continuation of the underlying action.
- 21. Instead of directing the City Attorney's office to dismiss the underlying action, Defendants encouraged, ratified and/or allowed the unfounded and unlawful underlying action to continue.
- 22. As a result of Defendants' actions, failure to act, deliberate indifference, arbitrary and/or capricious conduct, Plaintiff was forced to take a significantly less challenging and lower paying position as other airports and airport authorities, and government entities who run airports would not hire her. As a further result, Plaintiff has been deprived of continuing upward mobility on her career

7

8

14

11

17

22

20

24

27

path. Plaintiff has been damaged emotionally and physically by the actions and inaction of Defendants. Plaintiff has also been damaged to the extent that the underlying action has negatively affected, and will continue to negatively affect, her future career prospects, wages, benefits and earning capacity.

- 23. Because of the Defendants' actions, Plaintiff was required to retain counsel to defend the underlying action and therefore incurred significant costs and attorneys fees which would have been unnecessary had Defendants not violated 42 U.S.C. §1983.
- 24. Defendants' actions, failure to act, deliberate indifference, arbitrary and/or capricious conduct, with regard to the deprivations and detriment that Plaintiff suffered was carried out in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983. At all times, Defendants have been, are presently and will be acting under the color and authority of the laws of the United States and the State of California. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff suffered economic and non-economic damages in an amount to be more precisely determined at trial.
- 25. Plaintiff seeks a judgment declaring that the intentional acts and the acts of deliberate indifference described above perpetrated by the Defendants are prohibited by the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983 and seek the relief set forth in the prayer for relief.
- 26. By failing to follow the minimum procedures required by the Constitution, state and local law, Defendants deprived Plaintiff of her liberty and property interests to be free of unlawful interference with her career in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983. At all times, Defendants have been, are presently and will be acting under the color and authority of the laws of the United States and the State of California.
- 27. Plaintiff therefore seeks a judgment declaring that the actions and the acts of deliberate indifference described above perpetrated by the Defendants are prohibited by the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983, and seek the relief set forth in the prayer for relief.

27<sub>.</sub>

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(42 U.S.C. §1983; Procedural Due Process Under U.S. Constitution Amend. XIV)

- 28. Plaintiff hereby refers to Paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive, and incorporates them herein by this reference.
- 29. Plaintiff has protected liberty and property interests in a career, profession and job conferred by the California State Constitution. Article I, Section 1 recognizes that "[a]ll people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights. Among these are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety, happiness, and privacy." Article 1, Section 7 recognizes that "(a) A person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law or denied equal protection of the laws...."
- 30. Defendants have a custom, policy, and/or they tolerate a custom or policy that results in intentional, arbitrary and/or capricious harm or deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's legal rights. Plaintiff was deprived of her liberty and property interests to be free of unlawful interference with her career without due process of law. Plaintiff was an employee of Defendant City of San Diego from 1997 to 2005. At all times, Plaintiff did her job to the best of her ability in accordance with the instructions, directions and supervision of her superiors.
- 31. Defendants either failed to follow or had no adequate or effective formal or informal policy to ensure that lawsuits filed against former employees were legitimate and supported by evidence before permitting them to be filed on behalf of the City of San Diego. When Plaintiff complained to Defendants, they were deliberately indifferent to Plaintiff's health, safety and welfare and none of them took any meaningful action to stop the frivolous and unlawful underlying action.
- 32. Instead of addressing these actions, Defendants encouraged, convinced, and/or allowed the underlying action to continue against Plaintiff thus perpetuating the economic and non-economic harm to Plaintiff.
- 33. As a result of Defendants' actions, failure to act, and/or deliberate indifference, Plaintiff was constructively halted in her career path. She was unable to obtain employment commensurate or better than her position with the City of San Diego because of the underlying action, which was based upon a fatally flawed "investigation" that lacked in fundamental fairness. Plaintiff has also been denied

7

14

16

17

20

22

24

25 26

27

28

career opportunities. Plaintiff has been damaged emotionally, physically and economically by the underlying action. Plaintiff has also been damaged to the extent that the publicity and fact of the lawsuit against Plaintiff has negatively affected, and will continue to negatively affect, her future career prospects.

- 34. Defendants did not follow the minimum procedures required by the Constitution, state and local law in response to Plaintiff's complaints regarding the underlying action. As a result of the foregoing actions, failure to act, and/or the deliberate indifference of Defendants, Plaintiff's career, profession and job opportunities have been negatively impacted along with her income, emotional health and physical health.
- 35. By failing to follow the minimum procedures required by the Constitution, state and local law, Defendants deprived Plaintiff of her liberty and property interests to be free of unlawful interference with her career in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983. At all times, Defendants have been, are presently, and will be acting under the color and authority of the laws of the United States and the State of California. As a result, Plaintiff suffered economic and non-economic damages in an amount to be more precisely determined at trial.
- 36. Because of the Defendants' actions, Plaintiff was required to retain counsel to defend the underlying action and therefore incurred significant costs and attorneys fees which would have been unnecessary had Defendants not violated 42 U.S.C. §1983.
- Plaintiff seeks a judgment declaring that the actions and the acts of deliberate indifference described above perpetrated by the Defendants are prohibited by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983 and seek the relief set forth in the prayer for relief.
- 38. By failing to follow the minimum procedures required by the Constitution, state and local law, Defendants deprived Plaintiff of her liberty and property interests to be free of unlawful interference with her career in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983. At all times, Defendants have been, are presently and will be acting under the color and authority of the laws of the United States and the State of California.

6

4

9

12

15

22

39. Plaintiffs therefore seek a judgment declaring that the intentional acts and the acts of deliberate indifference described above perpetrated by the Defendants are prohibited by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983, and seek the relief set forth in the prayer for relief.

# THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

- (42 U.S.C. §1983; Substantive Due Process Under U.S. Constitution Amend. XIV)
- 40. Plaintiff hereby refers to Paragraphs 1 through 39, inclusive, and incorporates them herein by this reference.
- 41. Defendants have a custom, policy, and/or they tolerate a custom or policy that results in intentional, arbitrary and/or capricious harm or deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's legal rights. Defendants interfered with Plaintiff's liberty and property interests in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Plaintiff was an employee of the City of San Diego from 1997 to 2005. After she left her employment with the City of San Diego, Plaintiff was sued by Defendants without any basis for believing that the suit was meritorious.
- 42. Defendants either failed to follow or had no effective or adequate formal or informal policy to ensure that suits filed on behalf of the City of San Diego were meritorious and supported by evidence. When Plaintiff complained to Defendants, they were deliberately indifferent to the financial, emotional, psychological and professional harm being caused to Plaintiff and none of them took any meaningful action to stop the harmful conduct.
- 43. Instead of addressing these actions, Defendants encouraged, convinced, and/or allowed the underlying action to continue against Plaintiff thus perpetuating the economic and non-economic harm to Plaintiff.
- 44. As a result of Defendants' actions, failure to act, and/or deliberate indifference, Plaintiff was constructively halted in her career path. She was unable to obtain employment commensurate or better than her position with the City of San Diego because of the underlying action and has been denied career opportunities. Plaintiff has been damaged economically, emotionally and physically by the underlying action. Plaintiff has also been damaged to the extent that the publicity and fact of the lawsuit against Plaintiff has negatively effected, and will continue to negatively affect, her future career

4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

prospects, wages, benefits and earning capacity.

- 45. Defendants' actions, failures to act, and/or deliberate indifference towards the harm Plaintiff suffered were carried out because of their failure and refusal to examine the basis, evidence and legitimacy of the underlying action. Through the foregoing actions, failure to act, and deliberate indifference, Defendants interfered with Plaintiff's liberty and property interests to be free of unlawful interference with her career. Moreover, Defendants' actions, failure to act, and/or deliberate indifference created a risk of physical, financial and emotional harm to Plaintiff and further demonstrated their deliberate indifference to the harassment and impediments to her liberty and property interests by rendering her more vulnerable to that danger by allowing the underlying action to continue. As a result, Plaintiff's substantive due process rights guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983 were violated. At all times, Defendants have been, are presently and will be acting under the color and authority of the laws of the United States and the State of California. As a result, Plaintiff suffered economic and non-economic damages in an amount to be more precisely determined at trial.
- 46. Because of the Defendants' actions, Plaintiff was required to retain counsel to defend the underlying action and therefore incurred significant costs and attorneys fees which would have been unnecessary had Defendants not violated 42 U.S.C. §1983.
- 47. Plaintiff therefore seeks a judgment declaring that the actions and the acts of deliberate indifference described above perpetrated by the Defendants are prohibited by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983, and seek the injunctive relief set forth in the prayer for relief.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as stated below:

- 1. Issue a judgment declaring that the acts of the Defendants described herein violate the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and further that the constitutional and statutory rights which have been violated are present rights of Plaintiff which must immediately be respected and protected.
  - 2. For general damages in an amount to be proven at time of trial;

- 3. For damages for loss of earnings and other employment benefits, past and present, and for loss of earning capacity in an amount to be proven at time of trial;
  - 4. For special damages in an amount to be proven at time of trial;
  - 5. For exemplary and punitive damages to be awarded according to proof at trial; ...
- 6. For interest on the aforesaid amount at a legal rate from and after the time when said amounts were due to Plaintiff;
  - 7. For costs of suit and attorneys' fees pursuant to state and federal statutes; and
  - 8. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just, proper, and appropriate.

Dated: feb. 4, 2008. Respectfully submitted,

ROSENSTEIN, WILSON & DEAN, P.L.O

By:

Paula S. Rosenstein, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff Tracy Means

28

## 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 3 TRACY MEANS. Case No. 4 Plaintiffs. **DECLARATION OF SERVICE** 5 v. 6 CITY OF SAN DIEGO, and DOES 1-30, 7 Defendants. 8 I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury that I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to this action; and that I served the individuals on the service list attached hereto the following documents: CIVIL COVER SHEET AND NOTICE AND REMOVAL OF CIVIL 10 **ACTION [28 U.S.C. § 1446]** in the following manner: 11 (Check one) 12 1) \_\_\_ By personally serving the individual named by personally delivering the copies to 13 the offices of the addressee. Time of delivery: \_\_\_\_\_ a.m./p.m. 14 15 By leaving, during usual office hours, copies in the office of the person served with the person who apparently was in charge and thereafter mailing copies (first 16 class mail, postage prepaid) to the person served at the place where the copies were left. 17 3) By leaving copies at the dwelling house, usual place of abode, or usual place of business of the person served in the presence of a competent member of the 18 household or a person apparently in charge of his office or place of business, at 19 least 18 years of age, who was informed of the general nature of the papers, and thereafter mailing copies (first class mail, postage prepaid) to the person served at 20 the place where the copies were left. 21 By placing a copy in a sealed envelope and placing it for collection and mailing with the United States Postal Service this same day, at my address shown above, 22 following ordinary business practices. (See attached service list.) 23 Executed March 27, 2008, at San Diego, California. 24 25 26

Case 3:08-cv-00580-WQH-POR Page 16 of 18 Document 1 Filed 03/27/2008 **SERVICE LIST:** Paula S. Rosenstein, Esq. ROSENSTEIN, WILSON & DEAN, P.L.C. 1901 First Avenue, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92101
Tel: (619) 232-8377
Fax: (619) 238-8376
Attorney For Plaintiff Tracy L. Means 

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO DIVISION

# 149155 - SH \* \* C O P Y \* \* March 27, 2008 14:55:21

#### Civ Fil Non-Pris

USAO #.: 08CV0580

Judge..: WILLIAM Q HAYES

Amount.:

\$350.00 CK

Check#.: PC438

\$350.00 Total->

FROM: MEANS V. CITY OF SD

Case 3:0  SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)  The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the							18 of 18								
by local rules of court. This form,	approved by the Judicial Con	nference of the Unit	ed States	in September 1974, is	s required	for the use of the Clerk of Co	urt for the purpose of initiating								
the civil docket sheet. (SEE INST						(VA.p.,									
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS TRACY MEANS				DEFENDANTS											
				CITY OF SAN DIEGO and DOES 1=30 C. U  08 MÅR 27 PM 2 52											
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego				County of Residence of First Listed San Diego											
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			NOTE: IN L	T) AND CON	NUIS PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)										
			NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE POCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.												
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Paula S. Rosenstien, Esq. ROSENSTEIN, WILSON & DEAN, P. L. C. 1901 First Avenue, Suite 300			Attorneys of Known) 8 Y.  Joe Cordileone, Deputy City Attorney Office of the City Attorney												
										1200 Third Avenue Suice 100 5 80 WQH POR San Diego, CA 981 CV					
									San Diego, CA	498	TUVUSBOV	V()H PNR			
			San Diego, CA 92101				(619) 533-5800								
			Tel: (619) 232-8377				(01) 050 000	•							
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC	TTION (Please on "V" in Or	no Pov Only)	шс	ITIZENSHIP C	F PRI	NCIPAL PARTIES (P	lace an "X" in One Box for Platetiff								
n. basis of succession	CITON (Frace all X III O	ne Box Only)	m. c	(For Diversity Cas			and One Box for Defendant)								
				(* ** ** ** *** *** *** ***	PTF	DEF	PTF DEF								
	3 Federal Question		Ci	tizen of This State	<b>⊠</b> 1										
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not	a Party)				of Business In Thi									
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of	Parties in Item III)	Ci	tizen of Another State	□ 2	2 Incorporated and Princ of Business In An	=								
			Cir	tizen or Subject of a	☐ 3	3 Foreign Nation	□6 □6								
				Foreign Country											
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	(Place an "X" in One Box Only	<i>(</i> )													
CONTRACT	TO	RTS		FORFEITURE/PE	NALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES								
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL IN		610 Agriculture	D	422 Appeal 28 USC 158	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust								
120 Marine 130 Miller Act	310 Airplane	362 Personal Injuded. Malpr		620 Other Food & 625 Drug Related S		28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking								
140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment	315 Airplane Product Liability	365 Personal Inj		of Property 21			450 Commerce								
	320 Assault, Libel &	Product Lial		630 Liquor Laws		PROPERTY RIGHTS	460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and								
& Enforcement of Judgment  151 Medicare Act	Slander  330 Federal Employers'	Injury Produ		640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs.		820 Copyrights	Corrupt Organizations								
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability	Liability	401	660 Occupational		830 Patent 840 Trademark	480 Consumer Credit								
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	340 Marine	PERSONAL PRO	PERTY	Safety/Health 690 Other			490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service								
153 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product Liability	370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Ler					850 Securities/Commodities/								
of Veteran's Benefits	350 Motor Vehicle	380 Other Person		LABOR		SOCIAL SECURITY	Exchange								
160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract	355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	Property Da		710 Fair Labor Sta	ndards	861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923)	875 Customer Challenge								
	360 Other Personal Injury	385 Property Da Product Lial		Act 720 Labor/Mgmt.	Relations	863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	890 Other Statutory Actions								
196 Franchise		T		730 Labor/Mgmt.F	leporting	864 SSID Title XVI	891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act								
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PET	TTIONS	& Disclosure A		865 RSI (405(g))	893 Environmental Matters								
210 Land Condemnation	441 Voting	510 Motions to	Vacate	790 Other Labor L			894 Energy Allocation Act								
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment 443 Housing/	Sentence Habeas Corpus	:	791 Empl. Ret. Inc		FEDERAL TAX SUITS	895 Freedom of Information								
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations	530 General		Security Act		870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	900Appeal of Fee Determination								
245 Tort Product Liability	444 Welfare	535 Death Penal				or Defendant)  871 IRS—Third Party	Under Equal Access								
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment	550 Civil Rights				26 USC 7609	to Justice  950 Constitutionality of								
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -						State Statutes								
	Other  440 Other Civil Rights														
V ODICIN				T. (	1 6		Annual to District								
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X"  ☐ 1 Original	in One Box Only)  yed from		Reinsta		erred from		Appeal to District  7 Judge from								
		ate Court	Reoper			Litigation	Magistrate								
			•				Judgment								
	Cite the U.S. Civil S	tatute under which	you are	filing (Do not cite ju	urisdictio	onal statutes unless diversity	y):								
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	42 U.S.C. section														
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of o	cause:													
	Plaintiff alleges	her civil rights	were v	iolated.											
VII. REQUESTED IN	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS	A CLASS ACTION	ON I	DEMAND \$			only if demanded in complaint:								
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 2	3				JURY DEMA	AND: Yes No								
VIII. RELATED CASE	(S)														
IF ANY	(See instructions):	UDGE				DOCKET NUMBER	``								
DATE 1 27	1		F ATTOR	NEY OF RECORD											
March , 2008	178 (0		مراع	L.L. O. RECORD											
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	// 11	-,													
11/21/	MOONT \$350	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDGE									
	· <del></del>														
in 80 3/2"	1/08					American Leg	alNet, Inc. www.USCourtForms.com								